

## **ELECTIONS**

### **I. RESTRICTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 121**

In Paragraphs 1-3 of the Office Action, it was asserted that restriction to a single invention is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 based on a division of the claims into two patentably distinct groups:

- I. Claims 1-35 drawn to a shock and vibration isolation system for mounting equipment to a base wall; and
- II. Claims 36-41 drawn to a method of operating a shock and vibration isolation system.

The Applicant hereby elects without traverse to prosecute the claims of Group I (i.e., claims 1-35) in the present application.

The Applicant notes and concurs with the Examiner's observation that the claims following correctly numbered claim 35 were inadvertently numbered 35-40. These claims, which should have been identified as claims 36-41, are canceled by the above amendment as non-elected claims.

### **II. SPECIES RESTRICTION**

In Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, it was asserted that the Application contains claims directed to three patentably distinct species:

- Species A - Figures 1-4;
- Species B - Figures 5 and 6;
- Species C - Figures 7A, 7B, 8, 9 and 10.

Based on this finding, it was asserted that an election of a single species is required and that the claims readable on this species must be specified.

The Applicant respectfully traverses this restriction. Specifically, the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's grouping of the claims. Figure 5 is a schematic illustration of a self-powering shock and vibration isolation system that includes a recharging arrangement 350 mounted to the load plate 302. Application, paragraph 63. The Applicant notes that the particular form of the recharging arrangement is not specified in

the schematic illustration of Figure 5. Further, the Application explicitly states that the recharging arrangement 350 may be mounted above or below the load plate 302. Application, paragraph 66.

The figures that follow Figure 5 are directed to more specific variations of the generalized system of Figure 5. They do not depict species that are distinct from the generalized system. Figure 6, for example, is a schematic illustration of a particular recharging arrangement and power supply that may be used in the system depicted in Figure 5. Figure 9 is a schematic illustration of a particular variation of the system of Figure 5 in which the recharging arrangement is mounted above the load plate. Figures 7A, 7B and 8 are illustrations of piezoelectric components that may be used in the system of Figure 9.

Based on the above, the Applicant submits that the embodiments of Figures 6-9, if anything, are subspecies of the system shown in Figure 5. Moreover, the Applicants submit that all of claims 1-35 read on the schematic illustration of Figure 5. The Applicant therefore elects to prosecute the claims associated with Figure 5.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

Based on the above elections, the Applicant respectfully requests that claims 1-35 be examined, allowed and passed to issue. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the Application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,



David E. Baker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 42,285  
Telephone: (804) 788-8762  
Facsimile: (804) 343-4598

Date: November 22, 2004

Please Direct all Correspondence to:  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS  
Suite 1200  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 955-1500 telephone  
(202) 778-2201 facsimile